

Evaluation Results: 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program

The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation

Executive Summary:

The Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) partnered with the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) as part of a national effort with thirty state fish and wildlife agencies to implement a new direct mail marketing program targeting resident lapsed anglers to increase fishing license sales.

The program included two separate direct mailings with coinciding local radio and online advertising. On May 30, 2008, 71,849 lapsed anglers were sent a postcard with a message to encourage them to once again become active anglers. On July 17, a second postcard was sent to those anglers who had not yet purchased a license.

The size of the final reconciled mailing list was 66,010 after accounting for undeliverable addresses and anglers who bought a license prior to receiving the mailing. Of the 66,010 lapsed anglers, 17,319 purchased a fishing license during the evaluation period for an overall response rate of 26.2%. These 17,319 anglers purchased 20,903 licenses and permits. Details include:

- Priority tier one experienced an above average response rate:
 - Tier 1 (bought a license four years straight before lapsing) = 35.0%
 - Tier 2 (bought a license three years straight before lapsing) = 24.1%
 - Tier 3 (bought a license in '03, '05 and '06 before lapsing) = 23.0%
 - Tier 4 (bought a license in just two previous years before lapsing) = 17.3%
 - Tier 5 (bought a license in '03, '04 and '06 before lapsing) = 22.9%
- The top five Tapestry™ segments with the highest response rates were:
 - Tapestry 6 – Sophisticated Squires (upper income, suburban) = 28.4%
 - Tapestry 17 – Green Acres (above avg. income, rural) = 27.8%
 - Tapestry 42 – Southern Satellites (below avg. income, rural) = 27.7%
 - Tapestry 41 – Crossroads (below avg. income, small town) = 27.1%
 - Tapestry 33 – Midlife Junction (mid income, suburban) = 27.0%

The program respondents generated \$160,164 in gross program revenue during the evaluation period. LDWF and RBFF invested \$110,580 in the program, resulting in net program revenue of \$49,583 and an ROI of 44.8%. Additionally, an estimated \$129,719 may be generated from the Sport Fish Restoration Program as a result of this program.

The 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program in Louisiana was a successful first-year effort to encourage lapsed anglers to again buy a license. The results will be used to improve next year's marketing efforts with a goal of increasing the overall return on investment and maximizing license sales.

Evaluation Results: 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program

The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries And the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation

Purpose and Introduction:

In 2008, the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) partnered with the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) as part of a national effort with thirty state fish and wildlife agencies to implement a new direct mail marketing program to increase fishing license sales. Designed to identify and target resident lapsed anglers, the program is directed at increasing participation in fishing and generating awareness of the connection between fishing license sales and conservation efforts.

For each participating state, RBFF Direct Mail Marketing Program begins with an analysis of the state's resident fishing license sales. Each state provides up to five years of their most recent unit-level sales data. The raw data is then processed to create a multi-year sales record for each individual angler. Each record is then appended with additional socioeconomic-based information that provides additional insight into the anglers' characteristics and lifestyle as they relate to recreational fishing. The combined purchase history and lifestyle information becomes the basis for identifying and prioritizing lapsed anglers.

Working together, staff from RBFF and the state fish and wildlife agencies develop an integrated marketing program designed to target lapsed anglers with a message that will encourage them to once again become active anglers. By design, the program includes two separate direct mailings with coinciding local radio and online advertising. The states have flexibility in customizing the types of mailing, message and graphics. In addition, the states may choose to place additional local advertising, as well as offer incentives to lapsed anglers who purchase a license during the campaign period.

At the end of the direct mail campaign, the states provide their most recent sales data for an evaluation of the program's effectiveness. This report presents an evaluation of the program's results in Louisiana.

Program Summary:

The following provides a summary of the main components of Louisiana's program:

- Target Audience: Approximately 70,000 lapsed anglers
- Implementation:
 - First Mailing:
Drop Date: May 30

- Mail Piece: Postcard
- Postal Class: Standard pre-sort
- Second Mailing:
 - Drop Date: July 17
 - Mail Piece: Postcard
 - Postal Class: Standard
- Incentive: Lapsed anglers purchasing licenses by September 1, could receive a free bumper sticker – “I’d Rather be Fishing in Louisiana”.
- RBFF supported the direct mail effort with the purchase of radio and online advertising (additional details are available in Appendix C):
 - Radio Advertising Dates: 6/2 – 6/22 & 7/28 – 8/17
 - Online Advertising Dates: 6/2 – 6/29 & 7/28 – 8/24
- LDWF did not purchase any additional advertising

Lapsed Anglers in Louisiana:

For the period covered by this analysis, Louisiana’s license year coincided with the fiscal year ending June 30. Records of resident fishing licenses sold for license years 2004 through 2008 were analyzed to identify anglers who purchased any form of fishing privilege (e.g., annual, short-term or combination licenses) in 2007, but did not purchase any form of fishing privilege in 2008. These anglers are referred to as “lapsed anglers”. To help prioritize lapsed anglers for the direct mail marketing program, their previous license purchases were examined.

A key finding of RBFF’s experiences in working with state agencies to implement integrated marketing programs is that lapsed anglers who have a more frequent purchase history (i.e. are recently lapsed) and a longer purchase history (i.e. have purchased numerous fishing licenses in the past) have the greatest response to marketing (when compared to those lapsed anglers who have a distant purchase history and a shorter purchase history).

Based on their purchase history, the lapsed anglers are classified into priority “tiers.” A “tier” reports how frequently an angler bought a license prior to lapsing. Table 1 defines each tier. Approximately nineteen percent of all Louisiana resident anglers who purchased a license between 2004 and 2008 were classified as having lapsed in 2008. Of those lapsed anglers, 19.1 % were classified in the top priority tier and 40.4% were in the lowest priority tier (Table 2).

Table 1. Definition of Tiers.

Lapse Tier	Years in which a license was purchased (x):				
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
1	x	x	x	x	
2		x	x	x	
3	x		x	x	
4			x	x	
5	x	x		x	
6		x		x	
7				x	

“x” denotes year in which a license was purchased.

Table 2. Anglers in Louisiana, 2003-2007.

	N	% of Records
Non-lapsed	745,941	80.8%
Lapsed	177,037	19.2%
Total Records	922,978	100.0%
All Lapsed Anglers:		
Tier	N	Percent
1	33,885	19.1%
2	13,599	7.7%
3	9,047	5.1%
4	19,225	10.9%
5	14,867	8.4%
6	14,806	8.4%
7	71,608	40.4%
TOTAL	177,037	100.0%

Prioritization and Recommendations:

Mailing list recommendations were developed for Louisiana based on previous RBFF work in other states that showed anglers from the highest ranked tiers and selected Tapestry™ lifestyle segments generate the best response to this form of marketing campaign. People’s preferences are likely to vary based on income, age, urban/rural lifestyle, where they are in life (single, family, empty-nest, retired, etc.) and more. This type of information is not available from the typical statistics provided by a state’s electronic license data base. To gain a better understanding of who is more likely to buy or not buy a license, Tapestry lifestyle data are used.

ESRI of Arlington, VA provides the Tapestry data service. Tapestry is built from Census Bureau data and other sources. From the ESRI website: “The Community Tapestry segmentation system provides an accurate, detailed description of America’s

neighborhoods. U.S. residential areas are divided into 65 segments based on demographic variables such as age, income, home value, occupation, household type, education and other consumer behavior characteristics.” Using the ESRI service, the records in the fishing license database were appended with Tapestry data. The appended data allow us to learn more about the lifestyles of people who purchase fishing licenses and gain a better understanding of who does and does not buy fishing licenses. The results allow state agencies and private businesses to become more focused and cost-effective in their marketing, recruitment and communication efforts.

A detailed analysis of the lapsed anglers suggested that the mailing list be drawn primarily from Tier 1. The full text of this analysis, “Analysis of the Louisiana Fishing License Data Base and Recommendations Regarding Mail List Contents,” can be found in Appendix B. Of the 17 Tapestry segments defined nationally by Tapestry to have fishing as part of their lifestyle, there were eight in Louisiana that were observed within Tier 1 as lapsing at a greater rate compared to the average Louisiana lapsed angler. These eight segments, of 66 possible segments, represent 18,209 anglers, or 54% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers. It was also recommended that Louisiana target an additional ten segments, which included higher income and more urban lapsed anglers, to bring the target audience up to 27,448, or 81% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers.

Based on the program budget and cost estimates, the program in Louisiana could include approximately 70,000 lapsed anglers in the first mailing. Because the budget allowed for a larger mailing than the initial recommendation, the LDWF expanded the list to include all of Tiers 1 through 4 with the remainder drawn from Tier 5 with an emphasis on the 18 recommended Tapestry segments. In addition to providing a larger pool of names for the program, this non-targeted approach has the added benefit of providing results across a broader range of tiers and Tapestry segments, thus helping identify any specific segments of lapsed anglers more likely to respond to marketing campaigns. This information will be useful in the development of future targeted campaigns tailored specifically to lapsed anglers in Louisiana.

Target Audience and Mailing List Development:

Louisiana’s target audience was approximately 70,000 lapsed anglers. This was made up of all the lapsed anglers in Tiers 1 through 4 with the remainder drawn from Tier 5, primarily from 18 recommended Tapestry segments.

Records in excess of 70,000 were provided to replace addresses removed after processing the list through the National Change of Address (NCOA) database. As a rule of thumb, enough extra addresses were provided to allow for a 10 to 15 percent loss through NCOA.

The first mailing list delivered to Louisiana included 90,623 records. LDWF did not request a control group.

Direct Mail Implementation:

The Louisiana direct mail program included two postcard mailings. Prior to the first mailing, the Louisiana list was processed through a National Change of Address (NCOA) service to remove bad and unknown addresses. A total of 71,849 lapsed anglers were drawn for the first mailing. Following the first mailing and prior to the second mailing, the list was updated to remove names of people who had purchased a license and names of people whose first mailing was returned as undeliverable.

First Mailing:

- Drop Date: May 30
- Number mailed to: 71,849 (plus 39 seed names)
- Postal Class: Standard pre-sort

Second Mailing:

- Drop Date: July 17
- Number mailed to: 60,056 (plus 37 seed names)
- Postal Class: Standard

Evaluation Methods:

The overall evaluation period under consideration is June 2 through August 19. The period for the first mailing begins the day that the target audience was expected to receive the first mailing (June 2) and ends before the target audience received the second mailing (July 19). The period for the second mailing begins the day that the target audience was expected to receive the second mailing (July 20) and ends 30 days later (August 19).¹

The two key performance measures included in this evaluation are:

1) *Response Rate*

- **Definition:** The total number of unique individuals who respond to the offer divided by the total number of unique individuals to which the offer was made. Response rate will be calculated for the program overall as well as by priority tier, Tapestry, and urbanization.
- **Data Source:** The fishing license database – resident fishing license sales.
- **Supporting Information:**
 - Final mailing lists with customer IDs utilized by the states for their first and second mailings.
 - Undeliverable addresses with customer IDs for both the first and second mailings.

2) *Return on Investment (ROI)*

- **Definition:** The revenue generated by the direct mail marketing program (revenue from license sales to the respondents of the direct mail program)

¹ For First Class mail, the evaluation period is considered to begin one day after the drop date. For Standard mail the evaluation period begins three days after the drop date.

minus the expenses associated with the direct mail marketing program (including the cost of the direct mail, radio and online advertisements) divided by these same expenses. Fixed costs are not included.

- **Data Source:** The fishing license database and project expenses:
 - Direct Mail Marketing Program Expenses from the state agency.
 - Radio and Online Advertising Costs from RBFF.
- **Supporting Information:**
 - Current Price Lists for all Fishing License Categories

Several adjustments in the original mailing list need to be taken into account to accurately calculate response. First, anglers who purchased a license prior to the date they received the first mailing were removed. In addition, anglers whose first or second mailing was returned as undeliverable were also removed from the calculation (where these could be identified individually, they were physically removed from the list. If only a summary count of undeliverable postcards was available they were accounted for mathematically in the calculation of the overall response rate.) The result is referred to as the “final reconciled mailing list” upon which all response rate calculations are based.

Louisiana sent its first mailing using standard, pre-sort in order to track its undeliverable mail. The postcards of 5,516 lapsed anglers were returned as undeliverable allowing them to be identified in the mail list. Accounting for these and the number of anglers on the mailing list who bought a license prior to the start of the direct mail program, the size of the final reconciled mailing list is 66,010 for the purpose of calculating the overall response rate (Table 3).

Table 3. Additional Mailing List Scrubs.

Mailing List Statistics	#	%
1st List - As Mailed	71,849	
Bought Before 1st Mailing	955	1.3%
Returned as Undeliverable	5,516	7.7%
Final Reconciled Mailing List *	66,010	

* Subtracting *Bought Before 1st Mailing* and *Returned as Undeliverable* from *1st List - As Mailed* may not necessarily result in the number in the *Final Reconciled Mailing List* since they are not mutually exclusive.

RESULTS

1. Response Rates:

Overall, of the 66,010 lapsed anglers who were exposed to one or two of the direct mailers, 17,319 or 26.2% purchased a fishing license during the evaluation period. The response to the first mail piece was 19.9%; the second mailing resulted in an additional 6.3% response (Table 4).

Table 4. Overall response rate to the program.

Overall Response To Louisiana's Direct Mail Effort	#	Response Rate
Final Reconciled Mailing List	66,010	
Response After 1st Mailing	13,166	19.9%
Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing	4,153	6.3%
Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	17,319	26.2%

The 26.2% of lapsed anglers who responded to the direct mailing purchased 20,903 licenses and permits (Table 5). Of these, 64.9% were Resident Basic Fishing licenses and 33.2% were Resident Senior Combination licenses. Altogether, these license sales generated \$160,163.50 in sales revenue after agent fees were accounted for (Table 11).

Table 5. License Sales

Licenses and Permits Purchased in Response to Louisiana's Direct Mail Effort			
License Code	Description	#	%
024	Res Basic Fishing	13,562	64.9%
049	Res Senior Hunt/Fish	6,948	33.2%
047	Res Hook and Line	144	0.7%
057	Nonresident Fishing Trip(1 day)	76	0.4%
079	R/NR Charter Passenger(3 day)	58	0.3%
025	Nonresident Fish Season	53	0.3%
042	Res La Sportsman's Paradise	24	0.1%
010	Res/NR Active Military Fishing	23	0.1%
040	Nonresident Fish Trip(4 day)	14	0.1%
220	Res N/A La. Nat'l Guard Hunt/Fish	1	0.0%
TOTAL		20,903	100%

The results in Table 6 confirm that lapsed anglers in higher priority tiers are more responsive to marketing efforts. The rate at which lapsed anglers in Tier 1 responded to the program (35.0%) was 45% higher than the second highest responding tier, Tier 2, which had a response rate of 24.1%. The lowest performing segment was Tier 4 which had a 17.3% response rate. Tier 5, made up of intermittent anglers, had higher response rate than Tier 4 (22.9% compared to 17.3%).

While overall license sales were responsive to the campaign, there may be subsets of lapsed anglers who responded more positively than others. This analysis can be used to better understand who responded to the test campaign and where to focus future marketing efforts. The detailed segments of lapsed anglers that are examined here include their lifestyle and level of urbanization in their place of residence.

The lifestyle segmentation is based on the tendency for people with similar tastes, lifestyles, and behaviors to cluster into similar neighborhoods and exhibit a comparable response to specific marketing messages. The key is to identify which segments characterize lapsed anglers and which of those are most likely to respond to targeted recruitment efforts. We utilize Community Tapestry, by ESRI, which combines lifestyle demography with spatial geography to classify lapsed anglers based on their street address. Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 examine these segments to help understand the type of lapsed angler who responded better or worse to the campaign. Additional detailed breakdowns are available in the Appendix A.

Table 7 lists those Tapestry segments that represent a substantial number of lapsed anglers and whose members responded better than the overall average (26.2%). Each of the segments in Table 7 includes at least 1.5% of total lapsed anglers in Louisiana's reconciled mail list. Several Tapestry segments that are not included in the table had higher than average response rates, but the very small numbers of lapsed anglers in those segments renders them inconsequential for future marketing efforts. The complete list of Tapestry segments and their response rates is included in Appendix A.

The top performing segment in Louisiana is "Sophisticated Squires" with a 28.4% response rate. The eight segments in Table 7 represent 48% of all lapsed anglers in Louisiana's reconciled mailing list, making them a significant target group for future marketing efforts. Five of the eight include fishing as a part of their lifestyle – those segments are denoted by the green shaded Tapestry code number in the first column of the table. Overall, this group of Tapestry segments had a 27.0% response rate – slightly higher than the 26.2% average Tapestry response rate.

Table 6. Response Rate, by Priority Tier.

Response by Tier	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
		#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
Tier 1	24,052	6,554	27.2%	1,860	7.7%	8,414	35.0%
Tier 2	9,805	1,781	18.2%	579	5.9%	2,360	24.1%
Tier 3	6,564	1,097	16.7%	413	6.3%	1,510	23.0%
Tier 4	14,549	1,882	12.9%	629	4.3%	2,511	17.3%
Tier 5	11,040	1,852	16.8%	672	6.1%	2,524	22.9%

Table 7. Significant* Tapestry Segments with Above-Average Response Rates.

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	1,416	316	22.3%	86	6.1%	402	28.4%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,706	372	21.8%	102	6.0%	474	27.8%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5,585	1,173	21.0%	373	6.7%	1,546	27.7%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	3,078	627	20.4%	208	6.8%	835	27.1%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,594	328	20.6%	102	6.4%	430	27.0%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	5,190	1,093	21.1%	299	5.8%	1,392	26.8%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,698	357	21.0%	94	5.5%	451	26.6%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	11,189	2,221	19.8%	738	6.6%	2,959	26.4%

* Accounting for at least 1.5% of mail list.

The highlighted boxes indicate Tapestry segments identified nationally by ESRI with fishing as a common characteristic of their lifestyle.

Table 8 summarizes all 66 Tapestry segments by their quartile performance. The top one-fourth of Tapestry segments had a collective response rate of 29.9%, higher than the “significant” Tapestry segments listed in Table 7. However, this top quartile accounts for only 6% of all lapsed anglers in the program. As stated earlier, some of the top performing segments found in the first quartile contain very small numbers of anglers and likely would not be worth targeting – unless all are combined into a single target group. Before any such effort is made, please note that some of these segments had too few lapsed anglers to draw any reliable conclusions. Using “International Marketplace” and “Trendsetters” as examples, with only one and seventeen lapsed anglers in the mailing respectively, it is possible that their high response rates are just a coincidence and may not be experienced again.

Seventeen of the 66 Tapestry segments include fishing as part of their members’ lifestyles. Sixteen of these segments were represented in Louisiana’s mail list, accounting for nearly two-thirds of the total. They are examined as a group in Table 9. Overall, these Tapestry segments exhibited a 26.6% response rate, only slightly better than the 26.2% response rate of the average Tapestry segment. In all, ten of the seventeen segments had a higher response rate than 26.2%. Not surprisingly, for lifestyles that include fishing, the majority of these Tapestry segments are found in rural or small town areas. This aspect is examined in greater detail next.

As shown in Table 10, when examined by the rural/urban character of their communities, the highest responding groups live in rural, small town and suburban neighborhoods with rural segments responding the best (26.9%). Together these urbanization groups account for about three quarters of the lapsed anglers in Louisiana’s reconciled mailing list. However, none of these urbanization groups had response rate significantly greater than the average 26.2%. The lowest responding groups were in urban centers (20.9%) and urban outskirts neighborhoods (24.2%).

Table 8. Response Rate of Tapestry Segments, by Quartile.

Quartile by Response Rate	# in Reconciled Mail List	% of Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
			#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
1st Quartile	3,993	6.0%	912	22.8%	280	7.0%	1,192	29.9%
2nd Quartile	41,721	63.2%	8,536	20.5%	2,656	6.4%	11,192	26.8%
3rd Quartile	15,155	23.0%	2,835	18.7%	946	6.2%	3,781	24.9%
4th Quartile	5,141	7.8%	883	17.2%	271	5.3%	1,154	22.4%

Table 9. Response Rate of Tapestry Segments that Include Fishing as Part of their Lifestyle.

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
37	Prairie Living	Rural	140	33	23.6%	18	12.9%	51	36.4%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	182	46	25.3%	17	9.3%	63	34.6%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	33	23.2%	9	6.3%	42	29.6%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	967	220	22.8%	61	6.3%	281	29.1%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,706	372	21.8%	102	6.0%	474	27.8%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5,585	1,173	21.0%	373	6.7%	1,546	27.7%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	3,078	627	20.4%	208	6.8%	835	27.1%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	5,190	1,093	21.1%	299	5.8%	1,392	26.8%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	761	150	19.7%	54	7.1%	204	26.8%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	11,189	2,221	19.8%	738	6.6%	2,959	26.4%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	6,733	1,332	19.8%	428	6.4%	1,760	26.1%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	20	3	15.0%	2	10.0%	5	25.0%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,489	267	17.9%	101	6.8%	368	24.7%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	1,849	325	17.6%	124	6.7%	449	24.3%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,174	208	17.7%	70	6.0%	278	23.7%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	502	81	16.1%	27	5.4%	108	21.5%
43	The Elders	Suburban	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	SUBTOTAL		40,707	8,184	20.1%	2,631	6.5%	10,815	26.6%

Table 10. Response Rate by Level of Urbanization.

Urbanization Group	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
		#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
Urban Centers	809	137	16.9%	32	4.0%	169	20.9%
Metro Cities	6,454	1,265	19.6%	410	6.4%	1,675	26.0%
Urban Outskirts	8,543	1,556	18.2%	515	6.0%	2,071	24.2%
Suburban	13,364	2,715	20.3%	813	6.1%	3,528	26.4%
Small Town	5,069	985	19.4%	341	6.7%	1,326	26.2%
Rural	31,692	6,490	20.5%	2,036	6.4%	8,526	26.9%

2. Return on Investment:

For a given use of money in an enterprise, the return on investment (ROI) is a measure of how much net profit (or net revenue in the case of government and non-profit agencies) is realized from that investment. One way to calculate the ROI is to compare the net revenue (profit) to the cost of the investment required to generate the revenue ((total revenue – total cost) / total cost). If an investment breaks even (total revenue is equal to the total cost and there is no profit) then the ROI is zero. If a project generates \$0.50 of net revenue (profit) for every one dollar of investment then the resulting ROI is 50%. If total costs exceed total revenue then the result is a net loss and the ROI is expressed as a negative percentage (e.g., \$0.25 loss for each dollar of investment results in a ROI of -25%).

In Louisiana, licenses that were sold during the direct mail program generated total license sales of \$170,667.50 (Table 11). A portion of each license sale is retained by the sales agent and is not realized as revenue by state government. The agent fees associated with license buyers targeted by the direct mail program are estimated to be \$10,504.00. The remaining \$160,163.50 represents the gross program revenue received by the state from the sales of licenses to people who were targeted by the direct mail program.

The costs to implement the program include \$46,798.03 in direct expenditures by the LDWF for printing and postage. The LDWF program included additional costs for incentives to encourage people to purchase a license which totaled \$5,818.00. The RBFF spent a total of \$57,964.20 for radio and online advertising in selected Louisiana media markets. In total, the LDWF and RBFF invested \$110,580.23 in the program. Subtracting this total investment from the state's gross program revenue yields net program revenue (i.e., net profit) of \$49,583.27. Comparing this net revenue to the total investment produces a positive ROI of 44.8%. For every dollar invested in the program the state of Louisiana received 45 cents of net revenue (profit) above and beyond the cost of the program.

In addition to the revenue generated directly by the license sales, the state of Louisiana receives funds from the Sport Fish Restoration Program (SFR) administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These funds are allocated to the states according to a formula based in part on the number of resident licensed anglers. While the exact amount varies from year to year depending on available funds and the number of anglers nationwide, it is estimated that the state of Louisiana received approximately \$7.49 for each licensed angler. Based on that figure, the lapsed anglers who bought licenses during the program are responsible for \$129,719.31 of federal funds provided to the LDWF to support fisheries management and improve boating access. Adding these funds to the net program revenue would bring the ROI for the program up to 162%.

Table 11. ROI

Revenue and Return on Investment Generated from Response to Louisiana's Direct Mail Marketing Program	
License Sales Revenue	
1st Mailing	\$ 129,373.00
2nd Mailing	\$ 41,294.50
Total License Sales	\$ 170,667.50
Agent Fees	
1st Mailing	\$ 8,031.50
2nd Mailing	\$ 2,472.50
Total Agent Fees	\$ 10,504.00
Gross Program Revenue	\$ 160,163.50
Program Costs	
Direct Mail Costs	\$ 46,798.03
Advertisement by State Agency	\$ -
Incentives	\$ 5,818.00
Other RBFF Marketing Costs	\$ 57,964.20
Total Program Costs	\$ 110,580.23
Net Program Revenue	\$ 49,583.27
ROI	44.8%
Estimated Additional Revenue	
Sport Fish Restoration Fund	\$ 129,719.31

Notes and Considerations:

Louisiana experienced two of the largest disasters in U.S. history in August and September of 2005, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. These storms devastated south Louisiana, claiming 1464 lives, destroying more than 200,000 homes and 18,000 businesses. Both storms struck the center of commercial and recreational fishing along the Gulf of Mexico coast. Satellite photos show that more than 13,000 square acres of coastal wetlands and a number of offshore barrier islands in the Gulf of Mexico disappeared entirely. The devastating impacts of the 2005 hurricanes on Louisiana fisheries led U.S. Commerce Secretary Carlos Gutierrez to announce formal fishery failure determinations.

The storms initially evacuated and displaced 1.3 million Louisiana residents. Parishes experienced significant population losses in the aftermath of the 2005 storms. The population of coastal Louisiana as a whole has rebounded since 2005 with only four other parishes other than New Orleans still below their 2005 population estimates.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

The 2008 Lapsed Angler Direct Mail Marketing Program in Louisiana was a successful first-year effort to encourage lapsed anglers to again buy a license. Key findings from the first year's results include:

- 17,319 lapsed anglers returned to fishing in the 2009 license year.
- These renewed anglers generated \$49,583.27 of net revenue to the state of Louisiana over and above the costs of the program for an ROI of 44.8%.
- An estimated additional \$129,719.31 may be generated from the Sport Fish Restoration Program by these renewals.
- The program generated a 26.2% response rate among lapsed anglers who were contacted by direct mail.
- The highest response to the program came from Tier 1 lapsed anglers. Future direct mail efforts should continue to focus on higher ranked tiers if maximum response rates are the goal.
- The highest response to the program came from anglers in eight key Tapestry lifestyle segments. Five of those eight segments include fishing as part of their lifestyle. Future efforts similar to this one should continue to focus on those Tapestry segments that responded best, while perhaps exploring other means to reach those segments with lower response rates.
- Senior license buyers made up roughly one-third of all respondents to the program. Further analysis of the age composition of Louisiana's lapsed anglers is recommended before choosing next year's target audience.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Government. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Appendices

Appendix A: Detailed Tables

Table A1. Response by Tapestry Segment

Table A2. Response by Size (N) of Tapestry Segment

Table A3. Tapestry Segment by Cumulative Response Rate

Table A4. Response by Tapestry Segment Identified with Fishing as Part of Lifestyle

Table A5. Response by Tapestry Segment - Sorted by Urban-Rural Segments

Appendix B: Analysis of the Louisiana Fishing License Data Base and Recommendations Regarding Mail List Contents

Appendix C: State Radio and Online Advertising Details

Appendix A: Detailed Tables

Table A1. Response by Tapestry Segment

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
0	none		69	15	21.7%	5	7.2%	20	29.0%
1	Top Runq	Metro Cities	82	15	18.3%	8	9.8%	23	28.0%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	594	113	19.0%	47	7.9%	160	26.9%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	407	88	21.6%	32	7.9%	120	29.5%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	342	80	23.4%	25	7.3%	105	30.7%
5	Wealthy Seaboard Suburbs	Metro Cities	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	1,416	316	22.3%	86	6.1%	402	28.4%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	1,532	340	22.2%	92	6.0%	432	28.2%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	57	11	19.3%	3	5.3%	14	24.6%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	73	10	13.7%	2	2.7%	12	16.4%
10	Pleasant-ville	Metro Cities	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
11	Pacific Heights	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	2,295	444	19.3%	145	6.3%	589	25.7%
13	In Style	Suburban	961	196	20.4%	55	5.7%	251	26.1%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,108	220	19.9%	64	5.8%	284	25.6%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	20	3	15.0%	2	10.0%	5	25.0%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	157	39	24.8%	11	7.0%	50	31.8%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,706	372	21.8%	102	6.0%	474	27.8%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,698	357	21.0%	94	5.5%	451	26.6%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	2,117	404	19.1%	129	6.1%	533	25.2%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	2	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
21	Urban Villages	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	780	149	19.1%	51	6.5%	200	25.6%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	17	4	23.5%	3	17.6%	7	41.2%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	287	54	18.8%	20	7.0%	74	25.8%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	967	220	22.8%	61	6.3%	281	29.1%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	11,189	2,221	19.8%	738	6.6%	2,959	26.4%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	147	31	21.1%	2	1.4%	33	22.4%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	761	150	19.7%	54	7.1%	204	26.8%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	927	184	19.8%	56	6.0%	240	25.9%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	171	30	17.5%	12	7.0%	42	24.6%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	182	46	25.3%	17	9.3%	63	34.6%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,489	267	17.9%	101	6.8%	368	24.7%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,594	328	20.6%	102	6.4%	430	27.0%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	651	138	21.2%	38	5.8%	176	27.0%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	1	100.0%	-	0.0%	1	100.0%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	409	74	18.1%	22	5.4%	96	23.5%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	140	33	23.6%	18	12.9%	51	36.4%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	302	49	16.2%	27	8.9%	76	25.2%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	367	81	22.1%	18	4.9%	99	27.0%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	45	6	13.3%	-	0.0%	6	13.3%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	3,078	627	20.4%	208	6.8%	835	27.1%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5,585	1,173	21.0%	373	6.7%	1,546	27.7%
43	The Elders	Suburban	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
44	Urban Melting Pot	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	59	16	27.1%	4	6.8%	20	33.9%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	5,190	1,093	21.1%	299	5.8%	1,392	26.8%
47	Las Casas	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	825	153	18.5%	46	5.6%	199	24.1%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	33	23.2%	9	6.3%	42	29.6%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	1,849	325	17.6%	124	6.7%	449	24.3%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	1,781	317	17.8%	103	5.8%	420	23.6%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	331	60	18.1%	19	5.7%	79	23.9%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,174	208	17.7%	70	6.0%	278	23.7%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	30	5	16.7%	2	6.7%	7	23.3%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	417	73	17.5%	19	4.6%	92	22.1%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	6,733	1,332	19.8%	428	6.4%	1,760	26.1%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	502	81	16.1%	27	5.4%	108	21.5%
58	NeWest Residents	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	84	18	21.4%	8	9.5%	26	31.0%
61	High Rise Renters	Urban Centers	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	2,597	482	18.6%	147	5.7%	629	24.2%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	64	9	14.1%	6	9.4%	15	23.4%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	449	62	13.8%	18	4.0%	80	17.8%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	47	7	14.9%	-	0.0%	7	14.9%
66	Unclassified		10	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			66,010	13,166	19.9%	4,153	6.3%	17,319	26.2%

Table A2. Response by Size (N) of Tapestry Segment

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	11,189	2,221	19.8%	738	6.6%	2,959	26.4%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	6,733	1,332	19.8%	428	6.4%	1,760	26.1%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5,585	1,173	21.0%	373	6.7%	1,546	27.7%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	5,190	1,093	21.1%	299	5.8%	1,392	26.8%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	3,078	627	20.4%	208	6.8%	835	27.1%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	2,597	482	18.6%	147	5.7%	629	24.2%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	2,295	444	19.3%	145	6.3%	589	25.7%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	2,117	404	19.1%	129	6.1%	533	25.2%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	1,849	325	17.6%	124	6.7%	449	24.3%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	1,781	317	17.8%	103	5.8%	420	23.6%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,706	372	21.8%	102	6.0%	474	27.8%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,698	357	21.0%	94	5.5%	451	26.6%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,594	328	20.6%	102	6.4%	430	27.0%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	1,532	340	22.2%	92	6.0%	432	28.2%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,489	267	17.9%	101	6.8%	368	24.7%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	1,416	316	22.3%	86	6.1%	402	28.4%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,174	208	17.7%	70	6.0%	278	23.7%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,108	220	19.9%	64	5.8%	284	25.6%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	967	220	22.8%	61	6.3%	281	29.1%
13	In Style	Suburban	961	196	20.4%	55	5.7%	251	26.1%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	927	184	19.8%	56	6.0%	240	25.9%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	825	153	18.5%	46	5.6%	199	24.1%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	780	149	19.1%	51	6.5%	200	25.6%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	761	150	19.7%	54	7.1%	204	26.8%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	651	138	21.2%	38	5.8%	176	27.0%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	594	113	19.0%	47	7.9%	160	26.9%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	502	81	16.1%	27	5.4%	108	21.5%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	449	62	13.8%	18	4.0%	80	17.8%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	417	73	17.5%	19	4.6%	92	22.1%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	409	74	18.1%	22	5.4%	96	23.5%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	407	88	21.6%	32	7.9%	120	29.5%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	367	81	22.1%	18	4.9%	99	27.0%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	342	80	23.4%	25	7.3%	105	30.7%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	331	60	18.1%	19	5.7%	79	23.9%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	302	49	16.2%	27	8.9%	76	25.2%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	287	54	18.8%	20	7.0%	74	25.8%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	182	46	25.3%	17	9.3%	63	34.6%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	171	30	17.5%	12	7.0%	42	24.6%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	157	39	24.8%	11	7.0%	50	31.8%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	147	31	21.1%	2	1.4%	33	22.4%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	33	23.2%	9	6.3%	42	29.6%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	140	33	23.6%	18	12.9%	51	36.4%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	84	18	21.4%	8	9.5%	26	31.0%
1	Top Runq	Metro Cities	82	15	18.3%	8	9.8%	23	28.0%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	73	10	13.7%	2	2.7%	12	16.4%
0	none		69	15	21.7%	5	7.2%	20	29.0%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	64	9	14.1%	6	9.4%	15	23.4%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	59	16	27.1%	4	6.8%	20	33.9%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	57	11	19.3%	3	5.3%	14	24.6%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	47	7	14.9%	-	0.0%	7	14.9%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	45	6	13.3%	-	0.0%	6	13.3%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	30	5	16.7%	2	6.7%	7	23.3%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	20	3	15.0%	2	10.0%	5	25.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	17	4	23.5%	3	17.6%	7	41.2%
66	Unclassified		10	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	2	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	1	100.0%	-	0.0%	1	100.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			66,010	13,166	19.9%	4,153	6.3%	17,319	26.2%

Table A3. Tapestry Segment by Cumulative Response Rate

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	1	100.0%	-	0.0%	1	100.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	17	4	23.5%	3	17.6%	7	41.2%
66	Unclassified		10	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	140	33	23.6%	18	12.9%	51	36.4%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	182	46	25.3%	17	9.3%	63	34.6%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	59	16	27.1%	4	6.8%	20	33.9%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	157	39	24.8%	11	7.0%	50	31.8%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	84	18	21.4%	8	9.5%	26	31.0%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	342	80	23.4%	25	7.3%	105	30.7%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	33	23.2%	9	6.3%	42	29.6%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	407	88	21.6%	32	7.9%	120	29.5%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	967	220	22.8%	61	6.3%	281	29.1%
0	none		69	15	21.7%	5	7.2%	20	29.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	1,416	316	22.3%	86	6.1%	402	28.4%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	1,532	340	22.2%	92	6.0%	432	28.2%
1	Top Runq	Metro Cities	82	15	18.3%	8	9.8%	23	28.0%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,706	372	21.8%	102	6.0%	474	27.8%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5,585	1,173	21.0%	373	6.7%	1,546	27.7%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	3,078	627	20.4%	208	6.8%	835	27.1%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	651	138	21.2%	38	5.8%	176	27.0%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,594	328	20.6%	102	6.4%	430	27.0%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	367	81	22.1%	18	4.9%	99	27.0%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	594	113	19.0%	47	7.9%	160	26.9%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	5,190	1,093	21.1%	299	5.8%	1,392	26.8%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	761	150	19.7%	54	7.1%	204	26.8%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,698	357	21.0%	94	5.5%	451	26.6%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	11,189	2,221	19.8%	738	6.6%	2,959	26.4%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	6,733	1,332	19.8%	428	6.4%	1,760	26.1%
13	In Style	Suburban	961	196	20.4%	55	5.7%	251	26.1%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	927	184	19.8%	56	6.0%	240	25.9%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	287	54	18.8%	20	7.0%	74	25.8%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	2,295	444	19.3%	145	6.3%	589	25.7%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	780	149	19.1%	51	6.5%	200	25.6%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,108	220	19.9%	64	5.8%	284	25.6%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	2,117	404	19.1%	129	6.1%	533	25.2%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	302	49	16.2%	27	8.9%	76	25.2%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	20	3	15.0%	2	10.0%	5	25.0%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,489	267	17.9%	101	6.8%	368	24.7%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	171	30	17.5%	12	7.0%	42	24.6%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	57	11	19.3%	3	5.3%	14	24.6%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	1,849	325	17.6%	124	6.7%	449	24.3%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	2,597	482	18.6%	147	5.7%	629	24.2%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	825	153	18.5%	46	5.6%	199	24.1%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	331	60	18.1%	19	5.7%	79	23.9%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,174	208	17.7%	70	6.0%	278	23.7%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	1,781	317	17.8%	103	5.8%	420	23.6%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	409	74	18.1%	22	5.4%	96	23.5%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	64	9	14.1%	6	9.4%	15	23.4%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	30	5	16.7%	2	6.7%	7	23.3%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	147	31	21.1%	2	1.4%	33	22.4%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	417	73	17.5%	19	4.6%	92	22.1%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	502	81	16.1%	27	5.4%	108	21.5%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	449	62	13.8%	18	4.0%	80	17.8%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	73	10	13.7%	2	2.7%	12	16.4%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	47	7	14.9%	-	0.0%	7	14.9%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	45	6	13.3%	-	0.0%	6	13.3%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	2	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			66,010	13,166	19.9%	4,153	6.3%	17,319	26.2%

Table A4. Response by Tapestry™ Segment Identified with Fishing as Part of Lifestyle

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
37	Prairie Living	Rural	140	33	23.6%	18	12.9%	51	36.4%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	182	46	25.3%	17	9.3%	63	34.6%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	33	23.2%	9	6.3%	42	29.6%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	967	220	22.8%	61	6.3%	281	29.1%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,706	372	21.8%	102	6.0%	474	27.8%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5,585	1,173	21.0%	373	6.7%	1,546	27.7%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	3,078	627	20.4%	208	6.8%	835	27.1%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	5,190	1,093	21.1%	299	5.8%	1,392	26.8%
28	Aspiring Young Families	Metro Cities	761	150	19.7%	54	7.1%	204	26.8%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	11,189	2,221	19.8%	738	6.6%	2,959	26.4%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	6,733	1,332	19.8%	428	6.4%	1,760	26.1%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	20	3	15.0%	2	10.0%	5	25.0%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,489	267	17.9%	101	6.8%	368	24.7%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	1,849	325	17.6%	124	6.7%	449	24.3%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,174	208	17.7%	70	6.0%	278	23.7%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	502	81	16.1%	27	5.4%	108	21.5%
43	The Elders	Suburban	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	Subtotal		40,707	8,184	20.1%	2,631	6.5%	10,815	26.6%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	1	100.0%	-	0.0%	1	100.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	17	4	23.5%	3	17.6%	7	41.2%
66	Unclassified		10	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	59	16	27.1%	4	6.8%	20	33.9%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	157	39	24.8%	11	7.0%	50	31.8%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	84	18	21.4%	8	9.5%	26	31.0%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	342	80	23.4%	25	7.3%	105	30.7%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	407	88	21.6%	32	7.9%	120	29.5%
0	none		69	15	21.7%	5	7.2%	20	29.0%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	1,416	316	22.3%	86	6.1%	402	28.4%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	1,532	340	22.2%	92	6.0%	432	28.2%
1	Top Runn	Metro Cities	82	15	18.3%	8	9.8%	23	28.0%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	651	138	21.2%	38	5.8%	176	27.0%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,594	328	20.6%	102	6.4%	430	27.0%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	367	81	22.1%	18	4.9%	99	27.0%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	594	113	19.0%	47	7.9%	160	26.9%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,698	357	21.0%	94	5.5%	451	26.6%
13	In Style	Suburban	961	196	20.4%	55	5.7%	251	26.1%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	927	184	19.8%	56	6.0%	240	25.9%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	287	54	18.8%	20	7.0%	74	25.8%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	2,295	444	19.3%	145	6.3%	589	25.7%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	780	149	19.1%	51	6.5%	200	25.6%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,108	220	19.9%	64	5.8%	284	25.6%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	2,117	404	19.1%	129	6.1%	533	25.2%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	302	49	16.2%	27	8.9%	76	25.2%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	171	30	17.5%	12	7.0%	42	24.6%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	57	11	19.3%	3	5.3%	14	24.6%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	2,597	482	18.6%	147	5.7%	629	24.2%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	825	153	18.5%	46	5.6%	199	24.1%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	331	60	18.1%	19	5.7%	79	23.9%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	1,781	317	17.8%	103	5.8%	420	23.6%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	409	74	18.1%	22	5.4%	96	23.5%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	64	9	14.1%	6	9.4%	15	23.4%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	30	5	16.7%	2	6.7%	7	23.3%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	147	31	21.1%	2	1.4%	33	22.4%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	417	73	17.5%	19	4.6%	92	22.1%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	449	62	13.8%	18	4.0%	80	17.8%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	73	10	13.7%	2	2.7%	12	16.4%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	47	7	14.9%	-	0.0%	7	14.9%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	45	6	13.3%	-	0.0%	6	13.3%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	2	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
	Subtotal		25,303	4,982	19.7%	1,522	6.0%	6,504	25.7%
	TAPESTRY TOTAL		66,010	13,166	19.9%	4,153	6.3%	17,319	26.2%

Table A5. Response by Tapestry Segment - Sorted by Urban-Rural Segments

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	# in Reconciled Mail List	Response After 1st Mailing		Marginal Response From 2nd Mailing		Cumulative Response After 2nd Mailing	
				#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate	#	Response Rate
1	Top Runq	Metro Cities	82	15	18.3%	8	9.8%	23	28.0%
3	Connoisseurs	Metro Cities	407	88	21.6%	32	7.9%	120	29.5%
9	Urban Chic	Metro Cities	73	10	13.7%	2	2.7%	12	16.4%
16	Enterprising Professionals	Metro Cities	157	39	24.8%	11	7.0%	50	31.8%
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	2,117	404	19.1%	129	6.1%	533	25.2%
22	Metropolitans	Metro Cities	780	149	19.1%	51	6.5%	200	25.6%
28	Aspirina Young Families	Metro Cities	761	150	19.7%	54	7.1%	204	26.8%
30	Retirement Communities	Metro Cities	171	30	17.5%	12	7.0%	42	24.6%
34	Family Foundations	Metro Cities	651	138	21.2%	38	5.8%	176	27.0%
36	Old and Newcomers	Metro Cities	409	74	18.1%	22	5.4%	96	23.5%
39	Young and Restless	Metro Cities	367	81	22.1%	18	4.9%	99	27.0%
52	Inner City Tenants	Metro Cities	331	60	18.1%	19	5.7%	79	23.9%
60	City Dimensions	Metro Cities	84	18	21.4%	8	9.5%	26	31.0%
63	Dorms to Diplomas	Metro Cities	64	9	14.1%	6	9.4%	15	23.4%
<i>Metro Cities</i>			6,454	1,265	19.6%	410	6.4%	1,675	26.0%
17	Green Acres	Rural	1,706	372	21.8%	102	6.0%	474	27.8%
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	967	220	22.8%	61	6.3%	281	29.1%
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	11,189	2,221	19.8%	738	6.6%	2,959	26.4%
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	182	46	25.3%	17	9.3%	63	34.6%
37	Prairie Living	Rural	140	33	23.6%	18	12.9%	51	36.4%
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	5,585	1,173	21.0%	373	6.7%	1,546	27.7%
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	5,190	1,093	21.1%	299	5.8%	1,392	26.8%
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	6,733	1,332	19.8%	428	6.4%	1,760	26.1%
<i>Rural</i>			31,692	6,490	20.5%	2,036	6.4%	8,526	26.9%
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	3,078	627	20.4%	208	6.8%	835	27.1%
49	Senior Sun Seekers	Small Towns	142	33	23.2%	9	6.3%	42	29.6%
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	1,849	325	17.6%	124	6.7%	449	24.3%
<i>Small Towns</i>			5,069	985	19.4%	341	6.7%	1,326	26.2%
2	Suburban Splendor	Suburban	594	113	19.0%	47	7.9%	160	26.9%
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	1,416	316	22.3%	86	6.1%	402	28.4%
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	1,532	340	22.2%	92	6.0%	432	28.2%
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	2,295	444	19.3%	145	6.3%	589	25.7%
13	In Style	Suburban	961	196	20.4%	55	5.7%	251	26.1%
14	Prosperous Empty Nesters	Suburban	1,108	220	19.9%	64	5.8%	284	25.6%
15	Silver and Gold	Suburban	20	3	15.0%	2	10.0%	5	25.0%
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	1,698	357	21.0%	94	5.5%	451	26.6%
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	927	184	19.8%	56	6.0%	240	25.9%
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	1,594	328	20.6%	102	6.4%	430	27.0%
40	Military Proximity	Suburban	45	6	13.3%	-	0.0%	6	13.3%
43	The Elders	Suburban	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
53	Home Town	Suburban	1,174	208	17.7%	70	6.0%	278	23.7%
<i>Suburban</i>			13,364	2,715	20.3%	813	6.1%	3,528	26.4%
8	Laptops and Lattes	Urban Centers	57	11	19.3%	3	5.3%	14	24.6%
20	City Lights	Urban Centers	2	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
23	Trendsetters	Urban Centers	17	4	23.5%	3	17.6%	7	41.2%
27	Metro Renters	Urban Centers	147	31	21.1%	2	1.4%	33	22.4%
35	International Marketplace	Urban Centers	1	1	100.0%	-	0.0%	1	100.0%
45	City Strivers	Urban Centers	59	16	27.1%	4	6.8%	20	33.9%
54	Urban Rows	Urban Centers	30	5	16.7%	2	6.7%	7	23.3%
64	City Commons	Urban Centers	449	62	13.8%	18	4.0%	80	17.8%
65	Social Security Set	Urban Centers	47	7	14.9%	-	0.0%	7	14.9%
<i>Urban Centers</i>			809	137	16.9%	32	4.0%	169	20.9%
4	Boomburbs	Urban Outskirts	342	80	23.4%	25	7.3%	105	30.7%
24	Main Street, USA	Urban Outskirts	287	54	18.8%	20	7.0%	74	25.8%
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	1,489	267	17.9%	101	6.8%	368	24.7%
38	Industrious Urban Fringe	Urban Outskirts	302	49	16.2%	27	8.9%	76	25.2%
48	Great Expectations	Urban Outskirts	825	153	18.5%	46	5.6%	199	24.1%
51	Metro City Edge	Urban Outskirts	1,781	317	17.8%	103	5.8%	420	23.6%
55	College Towns	Urban Outskirts	417	73	17.5%	19	4.6%	92	22.1%
57	Simple Living	Urban Outskirts	502	81	16.1%	27	5.4%	108	21.5%
59	Southwestern Families	Urban Outskirts	1	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	2,597	482	18.6%	147	5.7%	629	24.2%
<i>Urban Outskirts</i>			8,543	1,556	18.2%	515	6.0%	2,071	24.2%
0	none		69	15	21.7%	5	7.2%	20	29.0%
66	Unclassified		10	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%
<i>Small Town - Rural</i>			36,761	7,475	20.3%	2,377	6.5%	9,852	26.8%
<i>Urban - Suburban</i>			29,170	5,673	19.4%	1,770	6.1%	7,443	25.5%
TAPESTRY TOTAL			66,010	13,166	19.9%	4,153	6.3%	17,319	26.2%

Appendix B:

Analysis of the Louisiana Fishing License Data Base and Recommendations Regarding Mail List Contents

**Prepared by Southwick Associates for the State of Louisiana and the Recreational
Boating and Fishing Foundation**

April 4, 2008

Years Analyzed: License years ending June 30, 2004-2008, with any angler who purchased a license for 2007 but not 2008 being defined as lapsed.

Number of Licenses Sold by Year: On the last page of this report, the annual number of customers (not licenses sold) for each type of license is listed. Do the results look accurate? If not, this could indicate a data problem that must be addressed to ensure a quality mailing effort. There is a big drop in the number of people purchasing licenses for 2008, which contains only a partial year's worth of data. More up to date license sales data for 2008 would prevent mailings being sent to people defined here as lapsed anglers who have since purchased a license.

Definitions of Tiers - Tiers will be used to help prioritize which lapsed anglers are included in your mailing, based on the degree to which they have lapsed:

Lapse Tier	Years in which a license was purchased (x):				
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
1	x	x	x	X	
2		x	x	X	
3	x		x	X	
4			x	X	
5	x	x		X	
6		x		X	
7				X	

Recommendations – Based on the analysis of your database (a copy of the analysis is attached in EXCEL), the following is a recommendation about who to target with your mailing. The final approach should be developed in consultation with the RBFF.

Based on previous RBFF work in other states that showed anglers from the highest ranked tiers responded better to campaigns, we recommend pulling most of the mail list from Tier 1. However, there are segments within this tier that we think will respond better. Of the 17 segments defined by Tapestry with fishing as part of their lifestyle, eight of them appear within Tier 1, in significant numbers, as having a greater rate of lapsing compared to the average lapsed angler. These eight segments, of 66 possible segments, represent 18,209 anglers, or 54% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers. These segments are listed

here and are ranked based on which ones have a greater percentage of lapsed anglers in Tier 1 compared to all lapsed anglers combined. Note that Midland Crowd, Rural Bypass, Rooted Rural, and Southern Satellites alone account for 47% of Louisiana's Tier 1 lapsed anglers and 43% of all its lapsed anglers (see the tables in cells A84 – S153 on the 'Tapestry Segments' page of the attached Excel file):

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	#
31	Rural Resort Dwellers	Rural	102
46	Rooted Rural	Rural	3,079
17	Green Acres	Rural	854
42	Southern Satellites	Rural	3,004
26	Midland Crowd	Rural	5,761
56	Rural Bypasses	Rural	3,933
25	Salt of the Earth	Rural	477
50	Heartland Communities	Small Towns	999

These segments are entirely rural and small town, and from below-average income segments for the most part. However, almost half of Louisiana's annual (non-lapsed) anglers and lapsed anglers come from more urbanized areas. We recommend adding some lapsed anglers from additional suburban and metro segments to more accurately reflect this. We also recommend adding some from higher-income segments to help determine which type of person responds best in order to improve future marketing efforts. Louisiana could consider adding Tier 1 lapsed anglers from these segments:

Tapestry Code	Tapestry Name	Urban/Rural	#
6	Sophisticated Squires	Suburban	668
29	Rustbelt Retirees	Suburban	474
7	Exurbanites	Suburban	705
18	Cozy and Comfortable	Suburban	793
41	Crossroads	Small Towns	1,611
33	Midlife Junction	Suburban	819
32	Rustbelt Traditions	Urban Outskirts	714
19	Milk and Cookies	Metro Cities	1,026
62	Modest Income Homes	Urban Outskirts	1,435
12	Up and Coming Families	Suburban	994

Adding these 10 tapestries to the eight above brings the total number of anglers to 27,448 or 81% of all Tier 1 lapsed anglers. In addition, recognizing that anglers from lower tiers may be intermittent anglers who would otherwise fish if given a slight push, Louisiana could test this by including some of these anglers in your mailing. We recommend that at least 1,000 anglers in your mailing are from Tier 2 segments. We recommend including Tier 2 anglers from the same segments listed above. However, when choosing which Tier 2 anglers to include in its mail list, Louisiana may wish to pay special attention to the following tapestries which are more likely to appear in Tier 2 than in Tier 1:

- Modest Income Homes (code 62)
- Up and Coming Families (code 12)

- Heartland Communities (code 50)
- Rural Bypasses (code 56)
- Crossroads (code 41)
- Rustbelt Traditions (code 32)
- Green Acres (code 17)

Based on the size of the mail lists requested by other states, it is likely that Louisiana will wish to expand its mailing effort beyond the above recommendations. Including all of Tier 1 would give Louisiana a mailing list of 33,885 anglers. Adding all of Tier 2 would bring this up to 47,484. However, anglers from the lower-ranked segments may not respond as well and could reduce the overall response rate. Instead, we recommend that Louisiana draw lapsed anglers in lower priority tiers from the same tapestry segments listed above to fill its desired mail list.

It is possible these anglers have lapsed from the state database involuntarily, meaning they either moved or encountered life issues that prevent fishing. However, many may have done something different with their free time and could be re-engaged. Only test mailings will tell us for sure.

Please let us know your final desired mix in your mail list, and the number you intend to mail to in your first mailing, and we will pull the list.

Louisiana: Annual Resident Fishing License Customers

License Code	License Name	2004		2005		2006		2007		2008	
		#	% Customers	#	% Customers	#	% Customers	#	% Customers	#	% Customers
024	Resident Basic Fishing	461,638	98.0%	453,847	97.6%	411,834	97.7%	427,131	97.6%	378,246	98.0%
042	Resident LA Sportsman's Paradise	1,624	0.3%	1,973	0.4%	2,138	0.5%	2,808	0.6%	3,248	0.8%
047	Resident Hook and Line	5,944	1.3%	6,288	1.4%	5,481	1.3%	5,168	1.2%	3,169	0.8%
079	Resident Char Pass 3 Day	2,009	0.4%	2,887	0.6%	2,026	0.5%	2,481	0.6%	1,416	0.4%
TOTAL		471,215	100.0%	464,995	100.0%	421,479	100.0%	437,588	100.0%	386,079	100.0%

Appendix C: State Radio and Online Advertising Details

Louisiana Radio Station List

Stations	Market	
KEDG FM	ALEXANDRIA	
KBKK FM	ALEXANDRIA	
KLAA FM	ALEXANDRIA	
KEZP FM	BUNKIE	
KJNA FM	JENA	
KJAE FM	LEESVILLE	
KLLA	LEESVILLE	
KZLG FM	MANSURA	
KAPB FM	MARKSVILLE	
KLIL FM	MARKSVILLE/MOREAU	
WPFC	BATON ROUGE	
KQKI FM	MORGAN CITY	
KCLFKCLF	NEW ROADS	
KKAY	WHITE CASTLE	
WNAT	NATCHEZ, MS	
WFCG FM	TYLERTOWN, MS	
WQBC	VICKSBURG, MS	
KROF	ABBEVILLE	
KSIG	CROWLEY	
KEUN	EUNICE	
KJCB	LAFAYETTE	
KANE	NEW IBERIA	
KSLO	OPELOUSAS	
KVPI	VILLE PLATTE	
KVPI FM	VILLE PLATTE	

Louisiana Radio Station List continued

Stations	Market	Format
KAOK	LAKE CHARLES	TALK
KGGM FM	DELHI	TALK
KFNV FM	FERRIDAY	AC
KMBS	MONROE	SPORTS
KMLB	MONROE	TALK
KPCH FM	RUSTON	OLDIES
KVCL FM	WINNFIELD	CTY
KMAR FM	WINNSBORO	CTY
WABL	AMITE	CTY
WTGG FM	AMITE	OLDIES
WBOX	BOGALUSA	CTY
WBOX FM	BOGALUSA	CTY
WJSH FM	FOLSOM	SMOOTH JAZZ
WFPR	HAMMOND	TALK
WSLA	SLIDELL	SPORTS
KTIB	THIBODAU	NEWS/OLDIES
KXOR FM	THIBODAU	CL ROCK
KDBH FM	NATCHITOCHES	CTYCTY
KWLV FM	MANY	CTY
KASO	MINDEN	NOST
KZBL FM	NATCHITOCHES	OLDIES
KNCB	VIVIAN	CTY
KNCB FM	VIVIAN	CTY
KTEZ FM	ZWOLLE	AC

Louisiana Online Advertising List

Market	URL
Alexandria	www.kalb.com
Baton Rouge	www.2theadvocate.com
Lafayette	www.theadvertiser.com , www.dailyworld.com
New Orleans	NOLA.com
New Orleans	www.wwltv.c.com